R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 014 449 SP 001 337

TEACHER EVALUATION--A STATE-BY-STATE ANALYSIS.

BY- MCPHAIL, JAMES H.

PUB DATE OCT 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.04 24P.

DESCRIPTORS- DEGREES (TITLES), *EFFECTIVE TEACHING, *MERIT RATING PROGRAMS, STATE ACTION, *STATE PROGRAMS, STATE STANDARDS, TEACHER CERTIFICATION, TEACHER EMPLOYMENT, *TEACHER EVALUATION, TEACHER EXPERIENCE, TEACHER MOTIVATION, TEACHER RATING, TEACHER SALARIES, *TESTS, GRADUATE RECORD EXAMINATION, NATIONAL TEACHER EXAMINATION (NTE)

STATES THAT HAVE ATTEMPTED TO EVALUATE TEACHERS BY WAYS OTHER THAN DEGREES GAINED AND/OR EXPERIENCE INCLUDE (1) SOUTH CAROLINA WHICH USED THE NATIONAL TEACHER EXAMINATIONS (NTE), (2) NEW YORK--MERIT PROMOTIONAL INCREMENTS, (3) DELAWARE--SALARY INCREASE FOR TEACHERS WITH CERTAIN RATINGS, (4) TENNESSEE--A SALARY DIFFERENTIAL SUPPLEMENT TO SUPERIOR TEACHERS, (5) GEORGIA--NTE SCORES FOR 6TH AND 7TH YEAR CERTIFICATES, (6) NORTH CAROLINA--A SERIES OF EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS, (7) FLORIDA--CAREER INCREMENT COMPETENCE AWARDS AND NTE SCORES, AND (8) UTAH--TWENTY DOLLARS FOR EACH DISTRIBUTION UNIT TO BE APPLIED FOR SALARY DIFFERENTIAL. AT THE PRESENT TIME, THE PROGRAMS OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TENNESSEE, GEORGIA, AND UTAH ARE STILL IN OPERATION, WHILE THE OTHERS HAVE BEEN DISCONTINUED, USUALLY BECAUSE THEY PROVED TO BE UNWORKABLE. THIS ARTICLE APPEARED IN THE SOUTHERN JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, OCT. 1967, 1, NO. 4, P.333-356. (AW)

SP 001337

Food J
copy 2

ED014449

TEACHER EVALUATION—A STATE-BY-STATE ANALYSIS

By

James H. McPhail

Professor of Educational Administration

Much consideration has been given in the past to evaluating teachers from the state level by factors in addition to degree and experience. This report deals first with the concern expressed in various states and second, the literature, studies, and legislation of certain states in the area of teacher evaluation.

Normally the only factors involved in teacher evaluation from the state level are degree and experience. In most instances the Minimum Foundation Program allows a certain amount of money to the local district for each minimum program teacher in terms of the degree that the teacher holds and the number of years of experience that the person has. However, in the past there has been considerable interest and discussion regarding other means of evaluation from the state level in addition to degree and experience. The following are examples of this concern.

In Mississippi in 1960 there was a determined effort on the part of the House Education Committee to include a third factor in the formula for determination of teacher salaries. This factor was the National Teacher Examinations.[1] However, in 1961 the Mississippi Education Association did not favor the use of the National Teacher Examinations as an additional factor in the determination of salary. The official attitude was as follows:

> Since the use of the National Teacher Examination is at best only one of many factors in determining quality of teachers, the Association believes that the National Teacher Examination should not be included in the Minimum Foundation Program. Therefore, the Association encourages continued research and exploration in the area of measuring the quality of teachers.[2]

[1] Letter to the author from Jerry J. O'Keefe, State Representative from Harrison County, Mississippi, June 23, 1961.

[2] Extract from resolutions adopted by the 1961 Mississippi Education Association House of Delegates.

Reprinted from The Southern Journal of ~~Teacher Education~~ EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, Oct. 1967, I, No 4, p 333-356

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

At a Mississippi Education Association Leadership Conference held in 1962 and at a Local Leaders Conference, one item discussed was that teachers must be willing to accept factors other than certification and experience in salary determination.[3]

The Mississippi Economic Council's Education Policy in 1962 called for the establishment of factors in addition to training and experience in determining teachers' salaries with the additional factors applied by the local boards in determining pay increments above the minimum schedule. This policy indicated that state funds for teachers' salaries should be in two parts. First, one part to provide a minimum annual salary schedule not less than the 1961-62 schedule and second, one to supplement salaries for superior teachers.[4]

Other states are also concerned with the problem of teacher evaluation on a state-wide basis. The West Virginia Education Association, anticipating legislative action has taken the following steps for the purpose of meeting arguments for a merit pay plan if and when such a plan should develop on the legislative front:

> Here at WVEA, we have many doubts about merit pay as it has been used in the past. With the thought in mind that a bill concerning merit pay might at some time appear in the state legislature, WVEA in 1959 adopted a career service increment plan. This career service increment plan has not been put into the form of a bill but will be in case a merit pay plan is presented to our legislature.[5]

A letter from the WVEA Executive Secretary in 1962 indicated that there was a strong public reaction against further increases in salaries along the pattern of outright base pay and experience increments. As a result there was developed in West Virginia a proposed professional growth and service dividend plan. Although this had not been officially adopted

---

[3] Mildred Breaux, *Local Leaders Conference Report* — Circular, Biloxi, Mississippi, October, 1962.

[4] Mississippi Economic Council, *Can We Afford More Delay?* Bulletin, Statement of Education Policies, Jackson, Mississippi, 1962, p. 6.

[5] Letter to Mrs. Fontaine from Gerald Powers, Director WVEA Personal Welfare, January 10, 1961. Cited hereafter as Beulah Fontaine, *Survey of State Education Associations on Merit-Pay Positions*, Pamphlet, Kentucky Education Association, Louisville, Kentucky, 1961, Mimeographed.

by the Association, it was felt that it would receive favorable consideration on the part of the public as well as within the profession.[6] No efforts have been made to determine salaries in recent years on any other basis other than degree and experience.[7]

The following resolution was adopted by the Illinois Education Association:

> It (the Association) believes that merit rating should not be used as a basis of salary scheduling, but it believes that consideration should be given to the possibility of allowing increments above the regular schedule for long service and as a reward for demonstrated outstanding service. It also believes that the profession has a responsibility for its own improvement, and urges the development of attitudes of critical evaluation within the profession and the identification of the qualities of good teaching toward improvement of instruction.[8]

The Pennsylvania State Education Association adopted the following resolution regarding the adoption of a merit rating system on a state-wide basis:

> Merit Rating—We disapprove any hasty adoption of a Statewide system of rating in which subjective judgment becomes the basis of salary increases. We recommend that the profession make an immediate and intensive study of methods whereby the meritorious professional employee will be rewarded by the local school district above and beyond a good basic salary schedule.[9]

Legislative action has been taken in the area of teacher evaluation in several other states. The remainder of the paper will deal with this action and the literature and studies that have been conducted on a state-wide basis.

South Carolina.—Realizing the need for an improved program of teacher education and certification, the State Board

---

[6] Letter to the author from Phares E. Reeder, Executive Secretary, WVEA, August 22, 1962.

[7] Letter to the author from Rex M. Smith, State Superintendent of Schools, State of West Virginia, April 17, 1967.

[8] Illinois Education Association, *Merit Pay for Teaching*, Research Department, August 1960, pp. 9-10. Cited hereafter as Beulah Fontaine, *Survey of State Education Associations on Merit-Pay Positions*, Pamphlet, Kentucky Education Association, Louisville, Kentucky, 1961. Mimeographed.

[9] Pennsylvania State Education Association, *Report of Committee on Resolutions*, Harrisbury, Pennsylvania, December, 1960. Cited hereafter as Beulah Fontaine, *Survey of State Education Associations on Merit-Pay Positions*, Pamphlet, Kentucky Education Association, Louisville, Kentucky, 1961. Mimeographed.

of Education in South Carolina authorized the investigation of educational qualifications of teachers in South Carolina. One phase of this investigation was related to excellent teachers. As a part of the report on excellent teachers, a study of the National Teacher Examinations was made in an attempt to utilize the results as one means of illustrating a relationship between scholarship and excellence in teaching. It was felt that the knowledge of the teachers as shown by the examinations would correlate with excellence in teaching as excellence is understood by those who employ the teachers. Two hundred and twelve selected teachers and forty eight college seniors took the examinations for this study. The results indicated that:

1. Successful teachers in South Carolina make respectable scores on the examinations.
2. Successful teachers in South Carolina are likely to make higher scores than prospective teachers who are seniors in the colleges of the State.
3. Teachers with advanced degrees are likely to rate higher on the examinations than those with lesser degrees.
4. The examinations appear to validate in general the amount of college education teachers have.
5. If a college education is to be recognized as a factor among qualifications for teachers, the examinations might, to an *important extent*, validate the education generally expected of college graduates.[10]

As a result of the above study, two suggestions were made. First, that the State Board provide for all candidates for certificates to take the National Teacher Examinations, with the resulting score of each candidate to be used in determining the type certificate for which the candidate would be eligible. Second, that a new plan of certification be adopted, wherein a combination of factors, including education, standing on the National Teacher Examinations, and experience be recognized as a basis for certification of teachers.[11]

---

[10] J. McT. *Excellent Teachers Their Qualities and Qualifications*, Report of the Investigation of Educational Qualifications of Teachers in South Carolina, R. L. Bryan Company, Columbia, South Carolina, 1944, pp. 225-283.

[11] *Ibid.*

The National Teacher Examinations was placed in the South Carolina state-aid salary schedule July 1, 1945, and went into effect for the school year 1945-46.[12] The minimum schedule of annual salaries in South Carolina is determined by certificate group, years of experience, level of preparation and a breakdown into grades, based on scores on the National Teacher Examinations.[13] This annual schedule is included in a tabular schedule within the statue itself.

In 1962, the Director of Teacher Education and Certification in South Carolina stated the following:

> Our thinking in general concerning the National Teacher Examination has been that there is a relationship between scores and excellent teachers. In addition to this, there is our thinking that use of the National Teacher Examination to a very great degree underwrites the qualifications of the college education of the prospective teachers.[14]

The executive secretary of the South Carolina Education Association indicated in 1962 that in general the teachers definitely feel the examinations served a purpose and raised standards in South Carolina. He further stated that he felt South Carolina could now do away with the examinations as far as certification is concerned and use this factor only as a means of selecting prospective candidates to enter the teacher training institutions.[15] Recently, the Director of Field Services of the South Carolina Education Association indicated that the members of the general assembly are strongly in favor of the National Teacher Examination as a factor in determining teachers salaries.[16]

The state of South Carolina was the only state revealed that uses a factor such as the National Teacher Examinations

---

[12] Letter to the author from Mr. Harry Riddle, Director Information and Research, South Carolina Education Association, July 23, 1962.

[13] National Education Association, Research Division, *State Minimum-Salary Laws and Goal Schedules for Teachers, 1966-67* Research Report (November 1966), Number 1966-R18, Washington, D.C.

[14] Letter to the author from George W. Hopkins, Director, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, Columbia, South Carolina, July 13, 1962.

[15] Letter to the author from P. M. Coble, Executive Secretary, The South Carolina Education Association, Columbia, South Carolina, July 10, 1962.

[16] Letter to the author from Thomas H. Ackerman, Director of Field Services, The South Carolina Education Association, Columbia, South Carolina, April 13, 1967.

on a state-wide basis in addition to the usual degree and experience in determining salaries.

North Carolina.—North Carolina became involved with the merit rating system question in 1945. The 1945 General Assembly authorized the Governor as follows:

> ....to appoint a commission of seven persons who shall fully investigate and report to the next General Assembly their findings as to the methods by which the compensation of teachers in the public schools of the State may be based upon merit and the individual capacity and ability of the respective teachers, to the end that such capacity and ability may be recognized and compensation provided therefore in the salaries paid such teachers of the State.[17]

The Commission invited the Board of Directors of the North Carolina Education Association to appoint an Advisory Committee on merit rating of teachers from the Association membership. There was made available to both the Commission and the Advisory Committee, the advice of three specialists who had spent years studying and directing research in teacher evaluation.

After an extensive survey of current practices of rating teachers and the application of such ratings to salary schedules, the Commission was unable to find an instrument for measuring teaching efficiency which could be accepted as valid for determining salaries. The Commission believed that such an instrument or device could be constructed, but there had not been the time nor the means to construct such an instrument.[18]

In 1947 the Committee did not make a report. In 1949, the Commission recommended to the General Assembly that a research project should be authorized by the state to determine the validity of various proposals and methods for measuring merit. This proposal was sent to the Governor with a recommended general research plan. This was approved by the Governor and General Assembly who appropriated funds and authorized the Governor to appoint the State Education Commission to supervise this and other studies.[19]

---

[17] North Carolina Education Association, Department of Research, *Information on Merit Rating*, Research Bulletin, Number 59-1, Raleigh, North Carolina, (October, 1959), p. 1.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[19] North Carolina Education Association, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

At the request of the State Education Commission, Dr. William A. McCall, Professor of Education, Columbia University, planned and directed a research project in one area of the state of North Carolina. The study was an attempt to determine the worth of existing methods and proposed methods of measuring teacher merit for salary purposes. There were 73 sixth grade teachers, their principals, and their 1164 pupils involved in the study which was completed in 1952. This is one of the most extensive studies in which pupil change was used as a criterion of teaching ability. The study was predicated on the teacher's proved ability to produce growth in pupils. The general results were as follows:

1. It was discovered that some teachers do obtain more growth from their pupils than others.
2. The highest positive values were obtained by self-ratings and pupil ratings.
3. Ratings by principals and peers showed negative values.
4. There is little relationship between training and merit.
5. The only persons found to be competent judges of the teachers' worth were students and a confidential self-rating.
6. Superintendents, supervisors, principals and colleagues tended to rate good teachers low and poor teachers high.
7. Experience as currently used should be replaced as a basis for determining salary.
8. There is a tendency for every adult associated with the teachers professionally to misjudge the teachers.[20]

McCall concluded that the research failed to find any system of measuring teacher merit which he was willing to recommend be adopted as a basis for paying the salaries of all teachers.[21]

As the results of this study were not conclusive, no attempts were made to utilize the results. However, there has been continued interest in relating salary to competence.

---

[20] William A. McCall and Gertrude R. Krause, "Measurement of Teacher Merit For Salary Purposes": *Journal of Educational Research*, (October, 1959), 53:73-75.

[21] North Carolina Education Association, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

During the 1957 session of the General Assembly, the question of merit was discussed in relation to the payment of salaries. A bill was introduced in the House but was not given a favorable report.[22]

In December 1957, the Board of Directors of the North Carolina Education Association notified the State Board of Education that they were concerned with and interested in the matter of merit rating and requested that a study be made. In August, 1958, the State Board of Education, taking into consideration that the General Assembly would soon be in session and would raise the usual questions on the application of a merit rating plan for teachers, authorized a comprehensive study of the problem through a commission which would report not later than July 1, 1960.[23]

In 1959, the General Assembly again discussed the question of merit pay for teachers. No action was taken, but the General Assembly adopted two resolutions pertaining to teacher evaluation. One resolution directed the State Board of Educaton to make a study of "Teacher Evaluation, Rating and Certification," and to report its findings to the 1961 Session of the General Assembly. Another resolution authorized and empowered the Governor to appoint a Commission for the Study of Merit Pay.[24]

This Commission for the Study of Merit Pay made investigations and reported to the 1961 General Assembly. In line with the recommendations of this Commission, a special legislative act authorized and made funds available for a North Carolina Merit Pay Study.

The purpose of the study was to establish, administer, and evaluate an experimental teacher evaluation and merit pay program in two or more local school administrative units which would serve as pilot centers. Three administrative units served as pilot centers.[25]

---

[22] North Carolina Education Association, *op. cit.*, p. 13.
[23] North Carolina Education Association, *op. cit.*, p. 14.
[24] North Carolina Education Association, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-23.
[25] Charles F. Carroll, Brank Profitt, and Robert G. Aldous, *Handbook for Pilot Centers*, North Carolina Teacher Merit Pay Study, Bulletin, State Department of Education, Raleigh, North Carolina, (December, 1961), p. 18.

The program was authorized for two years starting with the school year of 1961-62 and extending through the school year 1962-63[26] During the first year the development of the plans and procedures were to be studied and formulated. The 1962-63 year was to be devoted to the application and actual administration of the plans. Merit salary increments were to be provided from state funds to be used during the second year of the project as compensation for recognized merit in teaching. This allocation of funds to pilot centers was to be made on a ratio basis, related to allocation of state funds to these units for instructional salaries.[27]

The North Carolina Experimental Program of Teacher Merit Pay which was authorized by the General Assembly of 1961 was extended by the General Assembly of 1963. This program involved approximately 1,170 educators as well as leaders at the State level. Approximately $400,000 was spent in efforts to determine to what degree superiority in teaching can be identified, and if it is feasible to pay teachers in terms of their demonstrated effectiveness.[28]

The major findings and recommendations included in the final report to the 1965 General Assembly are as follows:

1. A uniform, Statewide program of merit pay is not feasible nor practicable at this time.
2. A merit pay program at the local level appears possible under a number of provisions deemed necessary for its success, according to the findings of this experimental study.
3. Programs and efforts now underway at the State level for the improvement of instruction should be continued, strengthened, and expanded.
4. Additional programs and efforts for the improvement of instruction at the State level and at the local level should be initiated and pursued with determination and enthusiasm.[29]

---

[26] Special Act of 1961 General Assembly, State of North Carolina.
[27] North Carolina Teacher Merit Pay Study, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-22.
[28] North Carolina, State Department of Public Instruction, *North Carolina Teacher Merit Pay Study*, A Report to the 1965 General Assembly The State Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina, p. 103.
[29] *Ibid.*, pp. 113-116.

New York.—After study and report by a Legislative Committee, in 1947 the New York Legislature passed a State Teachers' Salary Law. From the view point of the drafters, the legislation provided a legal, state-wide basis for recognition of superior teaching performance. The new legislation provided for different levels and a definite percentage of the teachers to be at each level after the new schedule was in full operation. For example, it was planned that 40 per cent of the teachers would be at Level I, at least 30 per cent would be at level II, and at least 20 per cent would be at level III, and at least 10 per cent would be at level IV.

The minimum obligation of a local board of education was to promote each year at least 75 per cent of those eligible for promotional increments at specified steps of the state-wide minimum schedule until such time that the new schedule was in full operation. The schedule was considered in full operation when the minimum percentages of teachers were placed at each level of the salary schedule. The law also specified that teachers should participate in the development of standards to be used in the evaluation process.[30]

The 1947 New York law experienced a four-year period of trial and experiment. It is reported that during the first four years of operation fifty per cent or more of the districts made no merit raises. It has been concluded that the merit principle was generally evaded by New York's school administrators during the four year period. Some districts had not made the necessary studies, many districts selected no one as eligible for promotion, others made salary increases automatic to the sixteenth step and others adopted schedules higher than the minimum requirements and avoided the need for compliance. Many promoted virtually every teacher with little pretense at careful evaluation.[31]

One general conclusion is that the Salary Law of 1947, worked to the advantage of teachers and the schools. A large

---

[30] Handbook of Suggestions for Administering the New York State Teachers' Salary Law of 1947, p. 35. Cited hereafter as California Teachers Association, Research Department, *Information on Merit Rating of Teachers*, Research Bulletin, Number 98, (December, 1956), p. 48. Mimeographed.

[31] *Ibid.*, pp. 11-17.

amount of public attention was called to the need for teacher salary improvement. Minimum and maximum salaries reached higher levels than it was felt they would have without the merit provision. Teachers achieved positive educational improvement by being stimulated to a more critical appraisal of their performances. Evidence was provided that a statewide minimum salary schedule does not necessarily act as a ceiling for salary schedules. Generally, the law was a factor in achieving a much higher state aid allocation to schools.[32]

Following the study of another special advisory committee, New York modified its original law in the 1951 Legislature. The law of 1951 moved the immediacy and some of the mandatory features of the 1947 version, and gave the local systems more freedom to work leisurely and with less restrictions in achieving the principle of merit. The school districts no longer were required to promote teachers by a percentage formula. The districts were freed completely as to what standards or criteria they would adopt to employ merit salaries. While still encouraging scholarly interest in the merit principle, the legislature rendered it inoperative for all practicable purposes by passing the 1951 law.[33]

By 1955 and 1956 individual districts were pursuing their own independent way into the policy of merit rating. Generally, there is some sort of evaluation on the basis of local standards; but the New York Teachers Association reported in January, 1956, that over 60 per cent of the schedules in the cities and other large districts operate automatically for degree teachers who are rendering satisfactory service. However, the 1956-57 salary schedules sent to the New York State Teachers Association indicated a revived interest in the practice of incorporating recognition of superior service into the non-automatic schedule. This was generally done by a super-maximum device or by bonus increments at points along the schedule.[34]

The Public School Personnel Advisory Group of the Mis-

---

[32] J. Cayce Morrison, "History of New York State's Approach to the Problems of Relating Teachers' Salaries to the Quality of Teaching Service," *Harvard Educational Review*, (Spring, 1952), 22:130-131.

[33] *Ibid.*, pp. 126-129.

[34] New York State Teachers Association, "Notable Developments in Salary Scheduling," *Public Education Research Bulletin* (May, 1956), 17:2.

sissippi Legislative Education Study Committee reported that the New York law requiring state-wide plans of merit pay for teachers was repealed in 1959.[35]

Utah.—The Utah Public School Survey Commission presented an interim report to the Governor, Legislative Council and Legislature in February, 1953. Included in this report was a recommendation that salaries of Utah educators be raised.[36] However, the Committee recommended that the raises should not be given to all equally but that ways should be determined to award them on the basis of merit.[37] This Commission also recommended that a committee be appointed to complete a comprehensive study, make recommendations, and determine the feasibility of teacher appraisal and merit salary programs for the public schools of Utah. The Legislative Council appointed the Utah School Study Committee of nine members composed of citizens from business, industry, government, agriculture and the teaching profession. This Committee directed the study of merit pay for superior teachers from the spring of 1954 to June, 1961.[38]

The members of this Committee felt that rewarding superior teaching competence was a sound principle and believed that if a fair merit program could be successfully established, it could be beneficial to education and to the teaching profession.

In 1954, the Committee issued its preliminary report and recommendations. In this report the principle of rewarding educators on the quality of performance was described as basically sound and desirable. This report recommended that field tests be established in local districts for the purpose of determining if superior teaching could be identified and if it was feasible in the Utah situation. Three problems were assigned to the pilot districts. These were:

---

[35] Legislative Education Study Committee, *Public Education in Mississippi*, Reports of Advisory Study Groups, Jackson, Miss., Bulletin, (December, 1961), p. 278.

[36] Utah School Merit Committee, *Reports and Recommendations*, Bulletin, Salt Lake City, Utah, (June, 1961), p. 1.

[37] Bernarr S. Furse, "Merit Pay Is Feasible and Something Desirable," *Phi Delta Kappan* XLII (January, 1961), 144.

[38] Utah School Merit Committee, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3.

1. The development of a definition or a description of teaching.
2. The development of reliable methods for measuring teaching effectiveness objectively.
3. The determination of whether relating salaries to such measurement was feasible and desirable.[39]

Legislation was enacted in 1955, 1957, and 1959 by the Legislature which provided funds for continuation of the study.[40]

In 1958, the Committee concluded:

1. "Personnel appraisal or evaluation is feasible in school systems which have prepared themselves by establishing an adequate set of basic conditions."
2. "Merit salary programming is also feasible in school systems which have developed appropriate evaluation procedure and which have established a set of basic conditions."[41]

The 1960 report indicated "that while continued research should go forward, establishment of merit programs in school districts on a gradual basis was desirable."[42] It was recommended that the merit program be continued and that up to five new districts each year take initial steps toward the establishment of programs. The Committee further recommended that state financial assistance for districts which elected to participate in the program should be made available. The Committee felt that this support was necessary to expedite complete adoption of a merit program in the state. A bill was introduced in the 1961 House of Representatives to this effect, but the bill failed to pass the House.

A bill was introduced in the 1961 session for additional funds to continue the study in the three districts where the study was still underway, but this bill was also defeated.[43]

After the defeat of the merit program in the 1961 Session,

---

[39] Furse, *loc. cit.*
[40] Furse, *op. cit.*, p. 145.
[41] Utah School Merit Committee, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
[42] Utah School Merit Committee, *op. cit.*, p. 4.
[43] Utah School Merit Committee, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

the final Merit Committee recommendations to the Legislative Council were as follows:

1. The previous recommendations of the Merit Committee should be kept before the Legislature and the people.
2. The study districts should be contacted to learn first hand the progress being made, the feasibility of the programs and benefits derived from such programs.
3. Teacher evaluation and merit salary programs should continue to be a study project in order to make recommendations to the Legislature.
4. The State Board of Education should be encouraged to give leadership and direction to individual districts.[44]

No information has been found that indicates continued action in this area until 1967 when the Utah State Legislature passed House Bill 241. Section 53-7-21 (8) of that bill reads:

> To assist the districts in developing salary differentials for those who qualify for professional certificates issued by the State Board of Education, an amount not to exceed twenty dollars ($20) per distribution unit shall be applied by each district for salary differentials from the state's contribution toward the cost of the basic program.[45]

This appears to be an effort of the Legislature to give the responsibility for determining salary differentials to the local administrators; yet, assuming the financial responsibility for such action. This is the only state located which is handling salary differentials in such a manner.

The Utah Education Association sponsored another interesting study in which the assumptions underlying the increment structure in the typical Utah salary schedule is questioned. These assumptions are:

1. The assumption of a straight-line relationship between teacher effectiveness and preparation or experience.
2. The assumption of teacher differences is potential improvement.[46]

---

[44] Utah School Merit Committee, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
[45] Letter from Richard S. Paterson, Administrative Assistant, Utah State Board of Education, Salt Lake City, Utah, July 11, 1967.
[46] Utah Education Association, *A Proposed Increment Structure*, Research Bulletin, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1962, p. 5.

In relation to these assumptions, the study indicates that teaching effectiveness does increase with increased experience; however, the increment in teaching effectiveness varies markedly and shows a curved line relationship during succeeding years of additional experience. Also noted was a nonlinear relationship between years of training and teaching effectiveness when experience is held constant. There is also no evidence to validate the assumption that the teacher with relatively many years of training is assumed to make proportionally more improvement through experience than will a teacher with relatively few years of college preparation.

From the analysis above, it was concluded that although there were many wholesome features of the single salary schedule, there is evidence that its increment structure is based upon some untenable assumptions.[47]

A summary statement pertaining to a theoretical basis for salary scheduling was as follows:

> An increment structure based on the theory and research of teacher effectiveness follows the Gaussian curve. Using such a structure in the single schedule can be simple in design, stimulating to the growth of the professional staff, and adaptable to any local school district.[48]

This means, that if one accepts the fact that teaching effectiveness does not follow a linear function of experience and training and if attempts should be made to fashion a salary schedule to fit generally the measures of teacher effectiveness, such a schedule must be arranged in a way that increments increase and decrease in sizes from year to year depending upon the curve based upon the theory and research of teacher effectiveness.[49]

The study included the existing Utah teacher salary levels and salary goals adapted with the recommended increment structure and made the following summary statement:

> The 1963-64 salary goal for Utah teachers provides a beginning salary of $4,500 for a bachelor degree teacher without previous experience and a maximum of $9,675 for a teacher with the

---

[47] *Ibid.*, p. 17.
[48] *Ibid.*, p. 17.
[49] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

> highest level of preparation working on the standard contract year. It is recommended that this salary goal be implemented through the increment structure defined in this bulletin.[50]

Florida.—The Florida State Legislature has been involved in the evaluation of teachers in three different programs.

In 1957, the Florida Education Association and citizens expressed a keen interest in improving the program of instruction offered in the Florida schools. There was also a feeling among lay citizens and Legislators that meritorious teachers should be financially rewarded and encouraged to stay teachers in the classroom. They sought a tremendous increase in state allocations for financing Florida's public schools.[51] The increased funds were granted as part of a package program. However, the Governor and the Legislature requested that the teaching profession experiment with the idea of awarding career increments to those who offer exceptionally meritorius teaching service, service to schools, and service to the community.[52]

The 1957 Legislature directed the development of a plan of career increments in all of the county school systems of the state, to be financed in part by state funds.[53] Each county was required to establish its own plan for awarding the increments. The determination of the criteria was left up to the local school boards, administrators and teachers. They were required to establish a planning committee by the 1957-58 school year and present county plans as part of the 1959-60 school budget. The actual evaluations were to start by the 1959-60 school year and the payments during the 1960-61 school year.[54]

The career increment evaluation was not required but the plan must be available for those who wish to be evaluated.

---

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

[51] Florida Education Association, *Guideposts for Development Career Increment Programs for Florida's Teachers*, Bulletin, Tallahassee, Florida, (August, 1958). p. 4.

[52] National Education Association, Research Division, *Career Increments in Florida Schedules for Teachers*, Research Memo, Number 1960-15, Washington, D.C. (June, 1960), p. 7.

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

[54] Florida State Department of Education, Research Division, *Survey of Career Increments*, 1960-61, Research Report, Number 13, Tallahassee, Florida, (March, 1961), p. 1.

The teachers must have the opportunity to apply for such evaluation not later than the completion of the tenth year of teaching.[55]

After the action by the Legislature, the 1958 Florida Education Association Convention adopted a resolution favoring careful study to determine the criteria for evaluation and that the criteria should be established jointly by classroom teachers, board members, staff members and administrators.[56]

As of February, 1960, it was concluded that the evidence needed to determine the status of the career increment program in Florida was not sufficient at the present time to reach any positive conclusions.[57] However, the career increment program was made optional with the county boards on July 1, 1961. The career increment program was abolished by chapter 61-263, Laws of Florida.[59]

The 1961 Legislature enacted the Competence Award Law. This law created a program of competence awards for teachers and other instructional personnel employed in the public schools. The purpose of the awards was to recognize and provide financial compensation for outstanding contributions to the process of learning and to retain in the public schools the services of its ablest personnel.[60]

The awards were to be paid entirely from state funds and in addition to all other salary allotements. In order for a teacher to be eligible for a competence award, he must (1) elect to become eligible, (2) score 600 on the National Teacher Examinations, (3) be evaluated by his principal or other supervisors as among the highest 30 percent of all the teachers in

---

[55] Ed Henderson, "Florida's Career Increment Plan," *Phi Delta Kappan* XLII (January, 1961), 152.

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 152.

[57] National Education Association, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

[58] Letter to the author from Eldridge R. Colling, Specialist in School Law and Information, Florida State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida, January 9, 1963 and Section 236.02 (3), Florida Statutes; Chapter 236, Laws of Florida, 1961.

[59] Letters from Mr. Eldridge R. Collins, Consultant, School Law and Administration and Mr. Floyd T. Christian, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida, June 27, 1967 and June 19, 1967.

[60] Florida Statutes; Section 236.021; Chapter 61-263, Section 1, Laws of Florida, 1961.

his county in competence during the year preceeding the award, and (4) be currently rendering satisfactory service in the county. The first evaluations were in the school year 1961-62, and the first awards were made in the school year 1962-63.[61] The competence award law was repealed in 1963.[62]

The 1961 State Legislature passed a law requiring satisfactory scores on the Graduate Record Examinations or the National Teacher Examinations to accompany all applications for new teaching certificates.[63] However, on June 26, 1962, the State Board of Education resolved to waive for one year the examinations requirement for experienced teachers.[64] This law also required definite scores on the examinations to qualify for an advance in rank, continuing contract, or for competence awards for both new and current teachers. The law was abolished by the legislature in 1967.[65]

Mississippi.—During the 1960 Legislature Session, there was considerable discussion regarding an additional factor to be used with degree and experience in determining teachers' salaries. As reported in the Mississippi Education Summary Sheet, Number 4, House Bill 404, which required a factor in addition to degree and experience in determining salary was defeated; but a similar bill passed the Senate.[66] The additional factor in these two bills was the National Teacher Examinations. Neither of these bills was acted upon favorably by both houses.

During the 1960 session a Legislative Education Study Committee was authorized by Senate Concurrent Resolution 145.

---

[61] Memorandum and Materials on Competence Award Law from Dr. James T. Campbell, Director, Division of Administration, and Mr. Eldridge R. Collins, Specialist in School Law and Information, to All County Superintendents, Florida State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida, March 15, 1962.

[62] Section 236.021 Florida School Laws; Chapter 63-230, 1963.

[63] Section 231.16 Florida School Laws; Chapter 63-231, 1961.

[64] Letter to the author from Mrs. Scott Reynolds, Administrative Assistant, State Department of Education, Certification Section, Tallahassee, Forida, August 16, 1962.

[65] Letter from Mr. Floyd T. Christian, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Tallahassee, Florida, June 19, 1967 and Senate Bill Number 499, Same as House Bill 647, which was signed by the Governor and became law.

[66] Mississippi Education Association, Reporting to *Local Leaders*, Pamphlet Number 4, Jackson, Mississippi, 1960.

This committee was given the responsibility of making a thorough study of public education in Mississippi. The Committee adopted a plan of dividing the study into areas. An outstanding educator was selected to serve as consultant for each group. Each group was composed of five to fifteen members, about half of whom were laymen with the remainder professional personnel. No legislators were included in the advisory study groups. The purpose of these advisory groups was to make recommendations to the Legislative Education Study Committee, who then formulated their own recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature.[67]

One of the advisory study groups studied the area of public school personnel. Under the area of public school personnel was teacher evaluation. There were three recommendations which the advisory group made to the Legislative Education Study Committee in the area of merit pay. The one recommendation that is most relevant to this study is as follows:

> The principle of Merit Rating is approved, limited to the school district in its application; financial encouragement through additional appropriations should be given to school districts and schools of education to foster educational research seeking the improvement of teaching and learning through plans of merit rating, and through other procedures.[68]

The two additional recommendations to the Governor and Legislature were as follows:

1. Since teachers are prepared at many different institutions, require that all trainees be required to take a nationally recognized examination such as the National Teacher Examination to determine their comparable educational backgrounds for teaching in the schools of Mississippi before being given a certificate.
2. Not require present degree teachers to take such an examination but any future upgrading of a certificate be contingent upon the acceptability of the score made by the teacher on the standardized examination.[69]

---

[67] Legislative Education Study Committee, *Public Education in Mississippi*, Reports of Advisory Study Groups, Bulletin, Jackson, Mississippi, (December, 1961), p. 4.

[68] Legislative Education Study Committee, *Public Education in Mississippi*, Report of Study Committee to the Governor and Legislature, Bulletin, Jackson, Mississippi (December, 1961), p. 138.

[69] *Ibid.*

Although the above recommendations were made to the Governor and Legislature prior to the 1962 Legislative Session, no action was taken regarding these recommendations nor has any real effort been made in this area since that time.

Delaware.—The legislature in the State of Delaware passed an Act in the early 1940's which provided salary increases for teachers with certain ratings.[70] The ratings were assigned by the school districts and practically all teachers received ratings which qualified them for salary increases. The law was repealed in 1947.[71]

Tennessee.—Section 24 of the 1961 General Education Bill in Tennessee granted the Commissioner of Education authority for developing and establishing an experimental plan under which a salary differential supplement might be granted to superior teachers in the public schools.[72] The amount of money made available was $25,000 per annum with the provision that the payments from this fund would be on a matching basis from local funds. School systems interested in participating in the experiment were asked to notify the Commissioner by May 22, 1961.[73]

The State Department of Education set up the tentative statements regarding the establishment and development of the experimental plan.[74] However, even though there have been appropriations by the legislature for paying superior teachers a supplement in school systems of the state, only one system in the state has participated in this program. This district did not apply for funds allotted after one year of experience with the program.[75]

---

[70] Letter to the author from R. L. Herbst, Assistant Superintendent in Charge of Business Administration, Department of Education, State of Delaware, November 20, 1962.

[71] Legislative Education Study Committee, *Public Education in Mississippi*, Reports of Advisory Study Groups, Bulletin, Jackson, Mississippi, (December, 1961), p. 278.

[72] Extract from Tennessee General Education Bill, 1961.

[73] Memorandum to County, City, and Special Districts School Superintendents from Joe Morgan, Commissioner of Education, State of Tennessee, April 27, 1961.

[74] Letter from J. H. Warf, Commissioner of Education, State of Tennessee, Nashville, Tennessee, July 11, 1967.

[75] Letter from Milton H. Hamilton, Director of Governmental Affairs, Tennessee Education Association, Nashville, Tennessee, June 29, 1967.

Oregon.—The Representative Council, which is the policy making legislative body of the Oregon Education Association, passed a resolution on March 4, 1960, stating that "The official position of the Oregon Education Association in the area of merit pay be one of open-mindedness, continued research and evaluation."[76] Since that time under the auspices of the Economics Welfare Committee of the Oregon Education Association, a study was conducted to determine the status of merit pay in Oregon School districts in 1961. This study dealt primarily with attempting to determine who did the evaluation of teachers for merit pay purposes and the evaluation techniques used. However, this was in individual school districts and not on a state-wide basis. The results of the survey indicated that generally the building principal and the superintendent evaluated the teachers for pay purposes while in fewer cases a combination of principal, superintendent, school board and committees of teachers did the evaluation. Evaluation techniques reported covered a wide range including class observations, pupil examinations, anecdotal records, self-evaluation, general success of the teacher, attitudes, teacher examinations, cooperation, and parent and student opinion. Generally, class observation was used with a combination of other items.[77]

The Oregon Professional Economics Committee currently has a subcommittee studying this problem; however, the investigation is in its early stages and little information is available.[78]

As noted, the studies have not been conducted as a result of any legislative action. No information was found that indicated any interest or pressure from the state level.

Georgia.—In the State of Georgia, for the fourth and fifth year certificate, the minimum schedule of annual salaries is fixed by the state board of education and is based upon preparation and experience.[79] However, recently the minutes of the

---

[76] Oregon Education Association, Research Division, *The Status of Merit Pay in Oregon School Districts*, Research Memo, Number 4, (January, 1961), p. 1.

[77] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[78] Letter from Roy E. Dancer, Director of Professional Services, Oregon Education Association, Portland, Oregon, July 6, 1967.

[79] National Education Association, Research Division, *State Minimum-Salary Laws and Goal Schedules for Teachers, 1966-67*, Research Report (November, 1966), Number 1966-Rli, Washington, D.C., p. 20.

State Board of Education showed that there was an extended discussion of the use of the National Teacher Examinations in the certification process. The Department of Education was directed as follows:

> .... draw up a proposal including those criteria which would most nearly assure competency of teachers and teaching in Georgia's public schools. Specifically, the staff is directed to consider the use of the NTE in certification of all teachers being certified in the State of Georgia for the first time and for all teachers up-grading their certificates. In addition, an alternate proposal might be to consider relating the NTE to the salary schedule.[80]

For the sixth-year certificate, two years of approved graduate study and certain scores on the National Teacher Examinations are required. These requirements are as follows:

1. If a person has additional college credit to be earned at the time the examination is taken, a combined score of 1225 must be achieved with a *minimum* common examination score of at least 550 and a teaching area examination score of 625.
2. If all college work has been completed before achieving the required scores, a combined score of 1250 must be achieved with a *minimum* common examination score of at least 550 and a teaching area score of 625.[81]

The six-year certificate is valid for five years. After September 1, 1968, applicants who begin their six-year programs will be required to complete a program in which the graduate institution confers some type of degree, certificate, or diploma.[82]

The life doctoral or seventh-year certificate is being issued as of July 1, 1967 ,to applicants who are eligible for a six-year certificate and who meet the following requirements:

1. Successful completion of a doctoral program from a regionally accredited graduate institution.

---

[80] Minutes of State Board of Education, June 15, 1966.

[81] State Department of Education, *Georgia Supplementary Instructions for the 1966-67 National Teacher Examination*, Leaflet, Division of Instruction, Teacher Education Services, October, 1966.

[82] Minutes of State Board of Education, February 22, 1967.

2. A recommendation by an authorized official of the institution verifying completion of the doctoral program in the field in which certification is sought.
3. Five years of acceptable school experience.[83]

As of February 22, 1967, the instruction committee of the State Board of Education has been considering whether or not the National Teacher Examinations should continue to be required if the applicants must earn a degree, certificate, or diploma from the graduate institution.[84]

SUMMARY

As indicated in the literature, several states have been concerned and involved in attempts to evaluate teachers by factors in addition to degree and experience. Table 1 gives a summary of these attempts. Although these efforts have been made, most have proven unsuccessful in determining factors and/or procedures that have proven to be workable; therefore, in most instances they have been discontinued. At the present time some states are still pursuing this area of concern on a state-wide basis but the emphasis seems to have subsided.

---

[83] State Department of Education, *The Life Doctoral (DD-7) Certificate*, Leaflet, Office of Instructional Services, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, October, 1966.

[84] Minutes of State Board of Education, February 22, 1967.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY TABLE OF ACTION BY STATES INVOLVED IN ATTEMPTS TO EVALUATE TEACHERS FROM THE STATE LEVEL BY FACTORS OTHER THAN DEGREE AND EXPERIENCE

State	*Organization authorizing or conducting studies*	*Factors used*	*Used at Present*
South Carolina	State Board of Education	National Teacher Examinations	Same
North Carolina	General Assembly State Board of Education	Experimental Programs	None
New York	Legislative Committee	Promotional Increments	None
Utah	Legislative Council School Study Committee Utah Education Assoc.	$20.00 for each distribution unit to be applied for salary differential	Same
Florida	Florida State Legislature	Career Increment Competence Awards NTE Scores	None
Mississippi	Legislative Study Committee	None	None
Delaware	———	Salary increases for teachers with certain ratings	None
Tennessee	———	Salary differential supplement to superior teachers	Same*
Oregon	Oregon Educational Assoc. Oregon Professional Economics Committee	None	None
Georgia	———	NTE Scores for 6th and 7th year Certificates	Same

*Only one school system in the state has participated in this program.